UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,212	03/23/2004	Taras Shkvarchuk	ODVFP007	3936

22434 7590 08/07/2008

BEYER WEAVER LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER	
MCLEOD, MARSHALL M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,212	SHKVARCHUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARSHALL MCLEOD	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 May 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,22-41 and 43-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20, 22-41 and 43-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20, 22-41 and 43-54 are pending in this action. Claims 21 and 42 are cancelled without prejudice.

Priority

2. The examiner does not acknowledge applicant's domestic priority based on pending applications 09/820,964 filed on March 30, 2001 and 09/820,966 filed on March 30, 2001. For benefit of domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120, . . . only an inventor or inventors named in the previously named application . . . are entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the earlier filed application.

Claim Objections

3. The amendment filed 06 May 2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "receiving an indication of asynchronous communications as a preferred mode for communications between the client machine and at least one web service;"

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. With respect to claims 1, 13, 34 and 36 (lines 7-8) "asynchronous communications as a preferred mode for communications" is indefinite and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is unclear whether the "preferred mode" is normal operating mode, a safe mode or some other specific operating mode. As such appropriate clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-7, 9-12, 14-20, 23-24, 26 and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niblett, in view of Han et al. (Publication No US 20020143819 A1), hereinafter Han.**

8. With respect to claim 1, Niblett discloses a computer-implemented method for selectively accessing one or more web services (Column 4, lines 35-38; Column 10, lines 25-29) from a client machine, the one or more web services and the client machine being accessible over a network (Column 1, lines 66-67; Column 2 lines 1-2), the method comprising:

a. providing a first file describing synchronous operations for a web service (Column 6, lines 24-30);

b. translating the first file into a second file describing asynchronous operations (Column 6, lines 24-30);

c. providing the second file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service(Column 12, lines 65-67 continued through to Column 13, lines 1-7);

d. receiving a request for information from the client machine with a conversion engine, the request being received over a synchronous interface (Figure 4, item 260, Column 11, lines 40-52);

e. processing the request in the conversion engine (Figure 4, item 260, Column 11, lines 42-45); and

f. transmitting the processed request over an asynchronous interface from the conversion engine to the at least one web service (Column 4, lines 39-44).

Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of

Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to provide a simple way for service providers to describe the basic format of requests to their systems regardless of the underlying protocol.

9. With respect to claim 2, Niblett discloses where the network is a local area network, and a wide area network (Column 1, lines 1-20).

10. With respect to claim 3, Niblett discloses receiving a response to the processed request from the at least one web service with the conversion engine (Figure 4, item 260, Column 11, lines 42-46), the response being received over the asynchronous interface (Column 11, lines 53-54); processing the response in the conversion engine (Figure 4, item 260, Column 11, lines 42-46); and transmitting the processed response over the synchronous interface from the conversion engine to the client machine (Column 4, lines 49-54).

11. With respect to claim 4, Niblett discloses blocking the client machine until one or more of the following events has occurred: a response to the received request has been obtained from the web service and delivered to the client machine (Column 5, lines 37-42), an error message has been delivered to the client machine, and a predetermined time period has passed (Column 5, lines 15-25).

12. With respect to claim 5, Niblett discloses receiving the request at a synchronous post interface (Column 4, lines 41-44); placing the request in a receive queue (Column 16, lines 2-7); routing the request to one or more delivery queues (Column 15, lines 44-49); and transferring the

request from the delivery queues to one or more asynchronous push interfaces (Column17, lines 6-17, push interfaces i.e. messages can be sent under the transactional control by the message queue manager).

13. With respect to claim 6, Niblett discloses receiving a confirmation from the at least one web service over the asynchronous interface that the processed request has been received by the at least one web service (Column 16, lines 13-26).

14. With respect to claim 7, Niblett discloses pushing the processed request to the at least one web service over the asynchronous interface (Column 4, lines 39-44).

15. With respect to claim 9, Niblett discloses performing security management including one or more of: authentication, authorization, security policy enforcement, decryption, and validation of digital signatures (Column 11, lines 22-26).

16. With respect to claim 10, Niblett discloses receiving the response at an asynchronous post interface (Column 4, line 49-50); placing the response in a receive queue (Column 3, lines 14-23); and routing the response to a delivery queue for the client machine (Column 3, lines 14-23).

17. With respect to claim 11, Niblett discloses transmitting a confirmation to the at least one web service over the asynchronous interface that the response has been received by the conversion engine (Column 5, lines 37-42).

18. With respect to claim 12, Niblett discloses pushing the processed response to the client machine over the synchronous interface (Column 4, lines 39-41).

19. With respect to claim 14, Niblett discloses where the network is a local area network, and a wide area network (Column 1, lines 1-20).

20. With respect to claim 15, Niblett discloses receiving a confirmation from the at least one web service over the asynchronous interface that the processed request has been received by the at least one web service (Column 16, lines 13-26).

21. With respect to claim 16, Niblett discloses transmitting a confirmation to the at least one web service over the asynchronous interface that the response has been received by the conversion engine (Column 5, lines 37-42).

22. With respect to claim 17, Niblett discloses a routing module operable to: route a received request to one or more web services (Column 8, lines 19-26); and route a received response to the request to the client machine (Column 5, lines 4-7).

23. With respect to claim 18, Niblett discloses a policy directory storing policies for performing security management including one or more of: authentication, authorization,

security policy enforcement, decryption, and validation of digital signatures (Column 11, lines 22-26).

24. With respect to claim 19, Niblett discloses a web service directory containing information about available web services and their communication interfaces (Column 10, lines 1-12).

25. With respect to claim 20, Niblett discloses wherein the web service directory includes one or more files for the available web services (Column 1, lines 57-62). Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to allow description of endpoints and services (i.e. server/client) and their messages regardless of what message formats or network protocols are used to communicate.

26. With respect to claim 23, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21 above. In addition to Niblett which discloses preserving any data structures defined in the first file in the second file (Column 10, lines 31-46).

27. With respect to claim 24, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 21 above. In addition to Niblett which discloses adding an acknowledge element in the asynchronous file, the

acknowledge element describing an acknowledgement that is returned when a request is asynchronously posted to the conversion engine by the client machine (Column 5, lines 15-25).

28. With respect to claim 25, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24 above. In addition to Niblett discloses wherein the acknowledgement includes a correlation identifier (Niblett, Column 5, lines 19-26).

29. With respect to claim 26, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 25 above. In addition to Niblett discloses wherein the correlation identifier is one or more of: a session identifier, a token, and a call identifier (Niblett, Column 5, lines 24-26).

30. With respect to claim 36, Niblett discloses providing a first file describing synchronous operations for a web service (Column 6, lines 24-30); translate the first file into a second file describing asynchronous operations (Column 6, lines 24-30); provide the second file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service(Column 12, lines 65-67 continued through to Column 13, lines 1-7); receive a request for information from the client machine with a conversion engine, the request being received over a synchronous interface (Column 2, lines 24-32); process the request in the conversion engine (Column 2, lines 32-34); and transmit the processed request over an asynchronous interface from the conversion engine to the at least one web service (Column 4, lines 39-44).

Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to provide a simple way for service providers to describe the basic format of requests to their systems regardless of the underlying protocol.

31. With respect to claim 37, Niblett discloses receive a response to the processed request from the at least one web service with the conversion engine, the response being received over the asynchronous interface (Column 4, lines 64-67; Column 5, lines 1-7); process the response in the conversion engine (Column 4, lines 45-48); and transmit the processed response over the synchronous interface from the conversion engine to the client machine (Column 4, lines 49-54).

32. With respect to claim 38, Niblett discloses block the client machine until one or more of the following events has occurred: a response to the received request has been obtained from the web service and delivered to the client machine (Column 5, lines 37-42), an error message has been delivered to the client machine, and a predetermined time period has passed (Column 5, lines 15-25).

33. With respect to claim 39, Niblett discloses receive the request at a synchronous post interface (Column 4, lines 41-44); place the request in a receive queue (Column 16, lines 2-7); route the request to one or more delivery queues (Column 16, lines 2-7); and transfer the request from the delivery queues to one or more asynchronous push interfaces (Column17, lines 6-17).

34. With respect to claim 40, Niblett discloses perform security management including one or more of: authentication, authorization, security policy enforcement, decryption, and validation of digital signatures (Column 11, lines 22-26).

With respect to claim 41, Niblett discloses receive the response at an asynchronous post interface (Column 4, line 49-50); place the response in a receive queue (Column 3, lines 14-23); and route the response to a delivery queue for the client machine (Column 3, lines 14-23).

35. **Claims 13, 22, 27-35, 43-53, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niblett in view of Han and further in view of Blair et al. (Patent No US 6,065,082), hereinafter Blair.**

36. With respect to claim 13, Niblett discloses a synchronous interface operable to (Column 11, lines 6-14): receive a request to interact with one or more web services from a client machine (Column 17, lines 38-42; i.e. web browser and messaging systems are web services) communicating synchronously with the conversion engine over a network (Column 2, lines 24-32), the request generated in accordance with a second file describing asynchronous operations for a web service (Column 6, lines 24-30), the second file translated from a first file describing synchronous operations (Column 6, lines 24-30); and deliver a response to the request from the conversion engine to the client machine over the wide area network (Column 8, lines 38-43);

an asynchronous interface operable to: deliver the received request from the conversion engine to the one or more web services communicating asynchronously over the wide area network (Column 8, lines 38-43); and receive a response to the request from the one or more web services over the wide area network (Column 1, lines 1-20).

Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to provide a simple way for service providers to describe the basic format of requests to their systems regardless of the underlying protocol.

The combination of Niblett and Han does not disclose a processing module operable to: convert a synchronous request into an asynchronous request; and convert an asynchronous response into a synchronous response.

However, Blair discloses a processing module operable to: convert a synchronous request into an asynchronous request (Column 18, Claim 1; Column 4, lines 55-63); and convert an asynchronous response into a synchronous response (Column 18, Claim 1; Column 4, lines 55-63).

It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the combined teachings of Niblett and Han with the teachings of Blair, in order to allow for faster and universal communication between the message sender and receiver, regardless of the format.

37. With respect to claim 22, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. In addition Niblett as modified by Han discloses translating a types part of the first file into a types part of the second file (Niblett, Column 5, lines 55-59), translating a message part of the first file into a message part of the second file (Niblett, Column 6, lines 24-30).

Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to provide a simple way for service providers to describe the basic format of requests to their systems regardless of the underlying protocol.

Niblett as modified by Han does not disclose translating a port type part of the first web service description language file into a port type part of the second web service description language file, translating a bindings part of the first web service description language file into a bindings part of the second web service description language file, and translating a service part of the first web service description language file into a service part of the second web service description language file.

However, Blair discloses translating a port type part of the first web service description language file into a port type part of the second web service description language file (Blair, Column 3, lines 32-41), translating a bindings part of the first web service description language file into a bindings part of the second web service description language file, and translating a service part of the first web service description language file into a service part of the second web service description language file (Blair, Claim 2; Column 11, lines 55-66).

It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett as modified by Han with the teachings of Blair, in order to handle more message conversions by speeding up the conversion process.

38. With respect to claim 27, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above. In addition Niblett discloses adding messages to the asynchronous file that are particular to asynchronous communication, the messages including one or more of (Column 5, lines 19-26): a message for returning an acknowledgement response (Column 15, lines 37-41), a message for polling (Column 5, lines 64-67; Column 6 lines 1-2), a message for acknowledging a received request, and a message for acknowledging a response from a web service (Column 16, lines 30-36). In addition to Niblett, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19).

39. With respect to claim 28, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 28 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the message for polling includes one or more of: a message

for polling using a session identifier, a message for polling using a topic, and a message for polling using a token (Niblett, Column 5, lines 64-67).

40. With respect to claim 29, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above. In addition Niblett discloses inserting a port type for asynchronous post operations and a port type for asynchronous poll operations into the second file (Column 11, lines 65-68; Column 12, lines 18-27).
Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to provide a simple way for service providers to describe the basic format of requests to their systems regardless of the underlying protocol.

41. With respect to claim 30, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 29 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the port type contains one or more of the following polling options: polling by session identifier, polling by topic, and polling by token (Niblett, Column 12, lines 47-59).

42. With respect to claim 31, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above. In addition Niblett discloses inserting binding for a post port type (Niblett, Column 6, lines 51-55); inserting a binding for a poll port type (Niblett, Column 6, lines 55-57); and setting an encoding

for messages that include the port types to reflect the encoding used by the conversion engine (Niblett, Column 8, line 67; Column 9, lines 1-5).

43. With respect to claim 32, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above. In addition Niblett discloses adding an asynchronous post port with a first uniform resource locator addressing the conversion engine (Niblett, Column 12, lines 30-32), and an asynchronous poll port with a second uniform resource locator to the conversion engine (Niblett, Column 12, lines 30-40).

44. With respect to claim 33, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above. In addition Blair discloses using a template stored in the conversion engine for translating at least part of the synchronous web service description language file into the asynchronous web service description language file (Column 18, Claim 1; Column 4, lines 55-63).

45. With respect to claim 34, Niblett discloses providing the second web service description language file to the client machine for further generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service (Niblett, Column 12, lines 65-67; Column 13, lines 1-7); receiving a request for information from the client machine with a conversion engine, the request being received over an asynchronous interface (Niblett, Figure 4, item 260, Column 11, lines 40-52); processing the request in the conversion engine (Niblett, Figure 4, item 260, Column 11, lines 42-45); and transmitting the processed request over a synchronous interface from the conversion engine to the at least one web service (Niblett, Column 4, lines 39-44).

Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file. However, Han discloses a web service description language file (Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Han in order to provide a simple way for service providers to describe the basic format of requests to their systems regardless of the underlying protocol.

Niblett as modified by Han does not disclose a computer-implemented method for converting a first web service description language file describing asynchronous operations for a web service into a second web service description language file describing synchronous operations, comprising: providing a first web service description language file describing asynchronous operations for a web service to a conversion engine; translating the first web service description language file in the conversion engine into a second web service description language file describing synchronous operations.

However, Blair discloses a computer-implemented method for converting a first web service description language file describing asynchronous operations for a web service into a second web service description language file describing synchronous operations (Column 18, Claim 1; Column 4, lines 55-63), compromising: providing a first web service description language file describing asynchronous operations for a web service to a conversion engine (Column 2, lines 45-47); translating the first web service description language file in the conversion engine into a

second web service description language file describing synchronous operations (Column 2, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett as modified by Han with the teachings of Blair. In order to convert the files quickly they must be identified and described to the conversion engine.

46. With respect to claim 35, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 34 above. In addition Niblett discloses translating a types part of the first web service description language file into a types part of the second web service description language file (Niblett, Column 5, lines 55-59), translating a message part of the first web service description language file into a message part of the second web service description language file (Niblett, Column 6, lines 24-30). Furthermore, Blair discloses translating a port type part of the first web service description language file into a port type part of the second web service description language file (Column 3, lines 32-41), translating a bindings part of the first web service description language file into a bindings part of the second web service description language file, and translating a service part of the first web service description language file into a service part of the second web service description language file (Claim 2; Column 11, lines 55-66).

47. With respect to claim 43, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above. In addition Niblett discloses translating a types part of the first web service description language file into a types part of the second web service description language file (Niblett, Column 5, lines 55-59), translate a message part of the first web service description language file into a message

part of the second web service description language file (Niblett, Column 6, lines 24-30). Furthermore, Blair discloses translate a port type part of the first web service description language file into a port type part of the second web service description language file (Column 3, lines 32-41), translate a bindings part of the first web service description language file into a bindings part of the second web service description language file, and translate a service part of the first web service description language file into a service part of the second web service description language file (Claim 2; Column 11, lines 55-66).

48. With respect to claim 44, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses preserving any data structures defined (Niblett, Column 10, lines 31-46) in the first web service description language file in the second web service description language file (Han, Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19).

49. With respect to claim 45, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses adding an acknowledge element in the web service description language file (Han, Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19), the acknowledge element describing an acknowledgement that is returned when a request is asynchronously posted to the conversion engine by the client machine (Niblett, Column 5, lines 15-25).

50. With respect to claim 46, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 45 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the acknowledgement includes a correlation identifier (Niblett, Column 5, lines 19-26).

51. With respect to claim 47, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 46 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the correlation identifier is one or more of: a session identifier, a token, and a call identifier (Niblett, Column 5, lines 24-26).

52. With respect to claim 48, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses adding messages to the asynchronous web service description language file that are particular to asynchronous communication, the messages including one or more of (Niblett, Column 5, lines 19-26): a message for returning an acknowledgement (Niblett, Column 15, lines 37-41), a message for polling (Niblett, Column 5, lines 64-67; Column 6 lines 1-2), a message for acknowledging a received request, and a message for acknowledging a response from a web service (Niblett, Column 16, lines 30-36).

53. With respect to claim 49, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 48 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the message for polling includes one or more of: a message for polling using a session identifier, a message for polling using a topic, a message for polling using a token (Niblett, Column 5, lines 64-67).

54. With respect to claim 50, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the instructions to translate a port part comprise instructions to: insert a post port for asynchronous operation and a poll port for asynchronous operation

(Niblett, Column 11, lines 65-68; Column 12, lines 18-27) into the second web service description language file (Han, Page 12, [0161], lines 5-19).

55. With respect to claim 51, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 50 above. In addition Niblett discloses wherein the port type contains one or more of the following polling options: polling by session identifier, polling by topic, and polling by token (Niblett, Column 12, lines 47-59).

56. With respect to claim 52, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses insert a binding for a post port type (Niblett, Column 6, lines 51-55); insert a binding for a poll port type (Niblett, Column 6, lines 55-57); and set an encoding for the messages that include the port types to reflect the encoding used by the conversion engine (Niblett, Column 8, line 67; Column 9, lines 1-5).

56. With respect to claim 53, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses add an asynchronous post port with a first uniform resource locator addressing the conversion engine (Niblett, Column 12, lines 30-32), and an asynchronous poll port with a second uniform resource locator to the conversion engine (Niblett, Column 12, lines 30-40).

57. With respect to claim 54, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above. In addition Niblett discloses using a template stored in the conversion engine for translating at least

part of the synchronous web service description language file into the asynchronous web service description language file. Furthermore, Blair discloses using a template stored in the conversion engine for translating at least part of the synchronous web service description language file into the asynchronous web service description language file (Column 18, Claim 1; Column 4, lines 55-63).

58. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niblett, in view of Bowman (Patent No US 6,438,594 B1).

59. With respect to claim 8, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. In addition Niblett discloses wherein transmitting the processed request comprises: transmitting an available processed request to the at least one web service through the asynchronous interface (Column 3, lines 15-25), Niblett does not disclose polling of the asynchronous interface by the at least one web service. However, Bowman discloses polling of the asynchronous interface by the at least one web service (Column 113, lines 23-35). It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the teachings of Niblett with the teachings of Bowman, in order to handle more message conversions by speeding up the conversion process and ensuring accurate transmission of messages.

Response to Arguments

60. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20, 22-41 and 43-54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARSHALL MCLEOD whose telephone number is (571)270-3808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 a.m-4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Marshall McLeod

/Ario Etienne/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157